

Executive Summary

Prepared for Charles H. Ramsey, Chief
Metropolitan Police Department
By the Office of Organizational Development
Nola M. Joyce, Executive Director

During the summer of 1998, District of Columbia residents were surveyed about their opinions on public safety problems and police service in the District¹. The Institute for Policy Research analyzed the data and documented their findings in a series of reports. This briefing summarizes the findings, which fall into the following four categories:

1. Public perceptions of the police (including demeanor, responsiveness, performance, misconduct, and trends in police performance).
2. Public satisfaction with police service (of both those who contacted police and those involved in police-initiated encounters).
3. Public perceptions of neighborhood problems (including fear of crime).
4. Community capacity.

Individual district comparisons will not be discussed in full here, but will be provided in more detail in a series of "district profiles."

1. Public Perceptions of the Police

Survey questions in this category focused on perceptions of:

- Officer demeanor (polite, concerned, helpful, and fair);
- Responsiveness to community (deal with problems that concern residents, work together with residents);
- Job performance (help victims, prevent crime, keep order on the streets);
- Misconduct (stop too many people, be too tough on those they stop, are physically or verbally abusive to residents, take bribes or get involved in local drug business); and
- Policing trends (local police performance over the last year, local police performance in the next year).

In general, the survey found residents to be supportive of the police. Residents over age 50 tended to give the police the highest marks, while respondents who were unemployed or low-income, without much formal education, and in the younger age groups had less favorable perceptions of the police. Younger African-American males were least likely to give the police a favorable rating.

¹ Telephone interviews were conducted with 2,216 randomly selected individuals.

Institute for Policy Research Report: Resident Survey Findings

Key findings for each of the categories are provided below.

Officer Demeanor

- 87 percent of respondents said police were either somewhat or very polite. The responses were similar for questions about fairness, concern, and helpfulness.
- On a scale of one (low) to four (high), the police received an overall average score of 3.25 for demeanor. District scores did not vary much, ranging from 3.1 to 3.4.
- In addition to older respondents, those most likely to give a favorable rating were homeowners and long-term residents.

Responsiveness to Community Concerns

- On a scale of one to four, the police received an overall average score of 2.99, almost exactly at the “good job” or “somewhat responsive” categories. Again, district scores did not differ much, ranging from 2.8 to 3.2.
- 45 percent of respondents said that police were very responsive, and another 45 percent said they were somewhat responsive to community concerns.
- Respondents gave less favorable marks for effectiveness at dealing with problems and working together with residents. In both cases only about 25 percent said police did a very good job. About a third said they did only a fair or poor job.

Job Performance

- This category received lower ratings than police demeanor and responsiveness, with an overall average score of 2.8.
- About 25 percent of respondents said the police did a very good job for each of the job performance questions (helping victims, preventing crime, and keeping order).
- The highest ratings were for keeping order: 71 percent said police did a very good or good job.
- The lowest ratings were for helping victims: 60 percent said police did a very good or good job.

Police Misconduct

- Most District of Columbia residents do not think the police stop too many people, are too tough on those they stop, or are verbally or physically abusive to ordinary citizens. Seventy-seven to 80 percent reported that these matters constituted no problem at all, and less than 10 percent thought that any of these was a big problem. The overall average score was 1.3, just above “no problem” in the response categories.
- Residents who had been stopped by the police in the previous year were twice as likely than those who had no contact to think that police stop too many people in their area, are too tough on those they stop, and are prone to physical or verbal abuse. The analysis also showed that being involved in a traffic-related or pedestrian stop had a stronger relationship with perceived misconduct than did the race, class or ‘lifestyle’² of the respondent.
- While the factors of age, race, education, and income produced considerable variation in reported opinions about police conduct, no group’s responses approached the “some problem” benchmark. Among the most pessimistic respondents – those under age 30 – one-third thought that police stopped too many people at least “sometimes,” and one-quarter thought they were verbally or physically abusive.

Policing Trends

- 41 percent of residents felt that in the past year the police in their neighborhood had gotten better, and only 4 percent thought they’d gotten worse.
- 55 percent of residents thought that police would get better in the coming year, and only 4 percent thought they would get worse.

2. Public Satisfaction with Police Service

The research also assessed the satisfaction with police service among those who had contact with the police in the year preceding the survey. Almost half of the residents surveyed initiated contact with police during that time, and about 20 percent of adult residents reported being stopped by police for a traffic stop or field interrogation. Having had personal contact in the last year with police was correlated with a resident being more likely to feel police misconduct was an issue.

² This term refers to characteristics such as marital status, family composition, or whether a home is owned or rented.

Institute for Policy Research Report: Resident Survey Findings

Resident-Initiated Contact

- About 48 percent (1,052) of residents said they had initiated contact with police: to report crimes, report accidents or medical emergencies, and/or to request advice or information. Sixty-three percent of the residents who contacted police were African American, 27 percent were white, 7 percent were Hispanic, and 3 percent were other races. These residents were asked in the survey about their opinions on police helpfulness and politeness, and about their satisfaction with the way police handled the situation.
- 82 percent of residents who contacted police thought the police were to some degree helpful (46 percent said “very”), and more than 91 percent thought police were at least somewhat polite (60 percent said “very”). Overall about three-quarters of residents were at least “somewhat satisfied” with the way police handled the incident (45 percent said “very”).
- The most important factors influencing resident satisfaction were: (1) police came quickly (73 percent of residents reported this); (2) police explained the action they would take (66 percent); (3) police paid attention to resident comments (85 percent); (4) police came to the scene (66 percent); (5) police gave a referral (23 percent).
- Residents who contacted police were most dissatisfied when police: (1) did not come (about 4 percent of residents reported this had happened); (2) did not pay attention to resident comments; (3) took too long to arrive (21 percent); (4) merely scheduled a visit. Residents who contacted police frequently were most dissatisfied with the service they received, as were Hispanics and younger district residents.

Recommendations:

Research suggests that client satisfaction will increase as police are more conspicuous in the pursuit of their duties: letting residents know they are searching for witnesses or evidence, taking careful note of what they are told, making helpful referrals, and giving those who contact them recognition and reassurance. Follow-up efforts by police need to be communicated back to callers, even if the problem has not been resolved; research strongly suggests that this kind of feedback plays a powerful role in influencing public opinion.

Police-Initiated Contact

- District residents who were stopped (about 420 respondents fell into this category, or 20 percent of those interviewed) were generally positive about how they were treated: 80 percent thought they were fairly well treated, and only 10 percent reported that they were badly treated.

Institute for Policy Research Report: Resident Survey Findings

- Being involved in a pedestrian stop rather than a traffic-related encounter (80 percent of all police stops) was associated with much higher levels of dissatisfaction with how police handled the incident. In general, better-off residents were involved in traffic stops while poorer and younger residents were involved in pedestrian stops.
- African-American males between 18-24 years of age were disproportionately likely to be stopped by police. Though they are only 3 percent of the adult population, they accounted for 8 percent of those stopped.
- Residents stopped by police reported higher satisfaction when police: (1) paid attention to what residents had to say; (2) explained why resident was stopped; (3) explained action they would take. Younger African-American males were least likely to think that police paid attention to them (46 percent), or that police explained why they made the stop (59 percent).

3. Public Perceptions of Neighborhood Problems and Fear of Crime

Neighborhood Problems

The survey and analysis classified and ranked 21 neighborhood problems of concern to District residents³. Residents were asked “how big of a problem” each issue was in their neighborhood. Research has indicated that the list of problems can be classified into three primary clusters of problem categories⁴:

- *Social disorder*, or “soft crimes,” indicate declining informal community control and general conditions. This category includes issues like prostitution, loitering, public drinking, and panhandlers.
- *Physical decay* has been found to contribute to other crime problems as well as fear of crime. It includes issues like dirty streets, run down housing, and graffiti.
- *Major crimes* includes car theft, attacks and robberies, and gang shootings and violence.

Out of residents’ top-ranked neighborhood problems, the first five were primarily social disorder issues: running red lights/stop signs (58 percent felt this was a problem); too few recreational programs (57 percent); loitering (52 percent); vandalized cars; and public drinking (48 percent). The next four mentioned were major crimes: stolen cars (48 percent); street drug dealing (47 percent); home break-ins (47 percent); and attacks and robberies (45 percent).⁵

³ See Table 1 which ranks the 21 problems based on the percentage of residents who thought an issue was “some” or a “big” problem. *Note that resident responses were limited to the 21 problems listed.*

⁴ Each of the 21 neighborhood problems mentioned, aside from “Too Few Recreational Facilities,” was assigned a problem category. “Graffiti” was given a dual problem category assignment (physical disorder and social disorder) due to its overlapping nature.

Fear of Crime

District residents were also asked about their fear of neighborhood crime, and how comfortable they would feel being out alone in their neighborhood at different times, or in different locations.

- A quarter of interviewed respondents said that they would feel somewhat to very unsafe being out alone in their neighborhoods at night. Significantly, 5 percent of residents said that they never go out at night (only 1 percent of residents said that they didn't go out during the day). Only 27 percent said that they would feel very safe being out alone at night.
- During the day, only 6 percent of residents said that they would feel unsafe being out alone in their neighborhood, and 62 percent said that they would feel very safe.
- When respondents were asked if there was any place in their neighborhood where they would be afraid to go either during the day or after dark, 51 percent said yes.

4. Community Capacity

The survey captured information on what is known among some in research circles as “community capacity”: neighborhood residents’ ability to solve problems on their own, and form partnerships with police and other agencies. Communities that are high in capacity evidence a great deal of mutual respect and trust, which facilitates cooperation among residents for mutual benefit. This component is often reflected in the density of local organizational life – organizations can institutionalize individual effort, sustaining problem solving when individuals tire or turn to other interests.

The level of community capacity across the District indicates police-community partnership potential: residents reported it likely that neighbors would intervene with a troublemaker, and very likely that they would organize to stop the closing of a local police station. Almost half of D.C. residents report involvement with a local community organization or religious institution. There was a fair degree of variance in individual district scores for these measures.

⁵ See Table 1; specific District rankings are included in Tables 2-8. In each table, the most frequently reported neighborhood crime from each of the three crime clusters – Social Disorder, Physical Disorder, and Major Crime – is highlighted.

Institute for Policy Research Report: Resident Survey Findings

Questions in this category gathered information on three key areas of community capacity:

- *Informal Social Control* – the likelihood that residents will confront a wrongdoer.
- *Organizational Involvement* – the extent of resident involvement in neighborhood organizations.
- *Neighborhood Anti-Crime Organizing* – the extent of resident involvement in anti-crime initiatives.

Key findings for each category are listed below.

Informal Social Control

- Close to two-thirds of respondents reported it likely or very likely that someone in their neighborhood would personally intervene with a troublemaker. Residents from District 2 reported the greatest likelihood of intervention, while residents from Districts 4 and 7 reported the lowest.
- Intervention was considered most likely if an elderly person were being harassed or children were spray painting a building (around 70 percent felt a neighbor would intervene), but significantly less likely (44 percent) if the issue was a fight in front of the respondent's house.
- Worth noting, a large percentage of respondents (averaging 22 percent for the three intervention survey items) volunteered that instead of a neighbor intervening, he or she would "just call the police."
- Almost 90 percent of respondents said that it would be likely that neighborhood residents would organize to try to keep a local police station open, and two-thirds responded 'very likely.'
- 59 percent of residents felt they lived in a neighborhood where people do things together and help each other. Less than half asked a neighbor to watch their home the last time they went out of town.

Organizational Involvement

- Overall, 46 percent reported household involvement in at least one of the following neighborhood organizations: local church or synagogue (24 percent), PTA or ANC (20 percent), local block club or community organization (16 percent), local neighborhood watch group or citizen patrol (9 percent).

Neighborhood Anti-Crime Organizing

- More than half interviewed had heard of local meetings focusing on addressing crime problems – and a third who knew of these meetings attended at least one.

Survey respondents who had attended a meeting (about 365 people) addressing crime problems reported:

- An MPD officer was present 84 percent of the time.
- Action was taken or something happened in their neighborhood as a result of the meeting 71 percent of the time.
- Only 10 percent of respondents felt the meeting was ‘not very useful’ for finding solutions to neighborhood problems – more than half felt it was ‘very useful,’ with the remainder feeling it was ‘somewhat useful.’ Similar numbers felt the meetings improved the community’s relationship with Metropolitan Police.

Institute for Policy Research Report: Resident Survey Findings

Table 1. Citywide Rankings

	Citywide Problems in Order of % Some and Big Problem	Problem Category	% Some and Big	% Big
1	Running Red Lights/Stop Signs	Social Disorder	58	30
2	Too Few Recreational Programs		57	31
3	Loitering Groups of People	Social Disorder	52	24
4	Vandalized Cars	Social Disorder	50	16
5	Public Drinking	Social Disorder	48	18
6	Stolen Cars	Major Crime	48	14
7	Street Drug Dealing	Major Crime	47	23
8	Home Break-ins	Major Crime	47	12
9	Attacks and Robberies	Major Crime	45	12
10	Dirty Streets	Physical Disorder	42	14
11	Poor Street Lighting	Physical Disorder	41	12
12	Truancy	Social Disorder	40	18
13	Beggars and Panhandlers really giving people a hard time	Social Disorder	37	13
14	Run Down Housing	Physical Disorder	36	10
15	Trash and Junk in Vacant Lots	Physical Disorder	35	14
16	Abandoned Buildings	Physical Disorder	32	11
17	Disruption Around Schools	Social Disorder	31	11
18	Gang Shootings and Violence	Major Crime	30	11
19	Abandoned Cars	Physical Disorder	27	10
20	Graffiti	Physical and Social Disorder	27	5
21	Prostitution	Social Disorder	23	11

Note: In each table, the most frequently reported neighborhood crime from each of the three problem categories – Social Disorder, Physical Disorder, and Major Crime – is highlighted.

Institute for Policy Research Report: Resident Survey Findings

Table 2. First District Rankings

	District 1 Problems	Problem Categories	% Some and Big	% Big
1	Loitering Groups of People	Social Disorder	59	19
2	Public Drinking	Social Disorder	57	16
3	Beggars and Panhandlers really giving people a hard time	Social Disorder	55	20
4	Home Break-ins	Major Crime	55	14
5	Too Few Recreational Programs		54	33
6	Running Red Lights/Stop Signs	Social Disorder	54	29
7	Attacks and Robberies	Major Crime	54	10
8	Street Drug Dealing	Major Crime	53	22
9	Vandalized Cars	Social Disorder	52	19
10	Stolen Cars	Major Crime	50	13
11	Poor Street Lighting	Physical Disorder	48	12
12	Dirty Streets	Physical Disorder	47	11
13	Run Down Housing	Physical Disorder	44	10
14	Truancy	Social Disorder	43	16
16	Abandoned Buildings	Physical Disorder	34	8
15	Trash and Junk in Vacant Lots	Physical Disorder	34	6
17	Gang Shootings and Violence	Major Crime	30	7
18	Disruption Around Schools	Social Disorder	28	4
19	Graffiti	Physical and Social Disorder	26	3
20	Prostitution	Social Disorder	17	7
21	Abandoned Cars	Physical Disorder	14	4

Note: In each table, the most frequently reported neighborhood crime from each of the three problem categories – Social Disorder, Physical Disorder, and Major Crime – is highlighted.

- Overall, residents indicated only a somewhat greater than average concern about the listed problems.
- ‘Public Drinking’ and even more notably, ‘Beggars and Panhandlers’ were issues of comparatively high concern in the First District.

Other Key Community Issues and Information:

Public Perceptions of the Police

- The First District received average scores on the following scales: officer demeanor (how polite, concerned, helpful, and fair police officers were), police responsiveness to the public (deal with problems that concern residents, work together with residents), and police job performance (help victims, prevent crime, keep order on the streets).

Public Satisfaction with Police Service

Residents who reported they had called police in the past year gave police scores ranging from below average to above average regarding their satisfaction with the way services were provided.

- The district received relatively negative scores on the percentage of officers that did not come to a scene at all, and the number of instances that they made residents wait too long.
- Police were given relatively high scores for being polite, clearly explaining what action they would take in response to the contact, and offering information about some other place they could get help or referring the problem to some other city agency or organization.
- Overall residents reported they were less satisfied than average with the way police handled the incident.

Residents who reported they were stopped by police gave police scores ranging from above average to below average regarding their satisfaction with the way the situation was handled.

- Residents were less satisfied than average with the job police did explaining why they wanted to talk with them, and explaining the action they would take.
- Residents were more satisfied than average with the way police responded, and how polite they were.

Community Capacity

- First District residents were most likely to report an awareness of community meetings taking place in their neighborhood.
- They were the second most likely to report a willingness to intervene in small-scale local trouble (kids spray-painting graffiti, a fight in front of their house, an elderly person being harassed by a teenager).
- First District residents were tied for last place in the reported percentage belonging to local neighborhood activities (neighborhood watch group or citizen patrol, PTA or ANC, local church or synagogue, local block club or community organization).
- First District residents were most likely to say they had reported a crime to the police in the last year.

Institute for Policy Research Report: Resident Survey Findings

Table 3. Second District Rankings

	District 2 Problems	Problem Categories	% Some and Big	% Big
1	Running Red Lights/Stop Signs	Social Disorder	64	22
2	Home Break-ins	Major Crime	54	6
3	Attacks and Robberies	Major Crime	47	5
4	Vandalized Cars	Social Disorder	44	6
5	Stolen Cars	Major Crime	43	6
6	Poor Street Lighting	Physical Disorder	38	6
7	Beggars and Panhandlers really giving people a hard time	Social Disorder	35	5
8	Too Few Recreational Programs		32	3
9	Dirty Streets	Physical Disorder	30	4
10	Public Drinking	Social Disorder	28	3
11	Graffiti	Physical and Social Disorder	25	2
12	Disruption Around Schools	Social Disorder	20	4
13	Loitering Groups of People	Social Disorder	15	2
15	Truancy	Social Disorder	12	2
14	Run Down Housing	Physical Disorder	12	1
16	Abandoned Cars	Physical Disorder	11	2
17	Trash and Junk in Vacant Lots	Physical Disorder	10	3
18	Abandoned Buildings	Physical	8	2
19	Street Drug Dealing	Major Crime	6	2
20	Prostitution	Social Disorder	5	2
21	Gang Shootings and Violence	Major Crime	5	2

Note: In each table, the most frequently reported neighborhood crime from each of the three problem categories – Social Disorder, Physical Disorder, and Major Crime – is highlighted.

- Overall Second District residents reported by far the lowest percentages for the listed problem categories. While the ‘% Some and Big Problem’ percentages reported for the first three issues, ‘Running red Lights/Stop Signs’, ‘Home Break-ins’, and ‘Attacks and Robberies’ were a little higher than average, the percentages reported on all other categories were somewhat to much lower than other districts.

Other Key Community Issues and Information:

Public Perceptions of the Police

- Second District residents gave police the highest score for the officer demeanor scale (how polite, concerned, helpful, and fair police officers were).
- Residents gave the highest composite score for police responsiveness to the public (deal with problems that concern residents, work together with residents).
- Residents also gave police the highest composite score on the job performance scale (help victims, prevent crime, keep order on the streets).
- Second District community members were least likely to consider police misconduct an issue.

Public Satisfaction with Police Service

Residents who reported they had called police in the past year gave police scores ranging from below average to above average regarding their satisfaction with the way services were provided.

- Residents were least likely to report that police did not come to the scene of a crime, and were most likely to report that police came right away.
- Residents gave Second District police less positive scores on paying careful attention to what they had to say, or being polite, and police were given the lowest scores on clearly explaining what action they would take in response to the contact.
- Overall residents found police slightly more helpful than the average for D.C., and were some of the most satisfied regarding the way police handled the incident.

Residents who reported they were stopped by police mostly gave them the highest rankings across the districts regarding their satisfaction with the way the situation was handled.

- Second District police received the highest ranking in paying careful attention to what residents had to say, clearly explaining the action they would take, and their overall level of satisfaction with the way the police responded.

Community Capacity

- Second District community members received the highest composite score regarding their willingness to intervene in a local altercation. They also reported that they would be least likely to 'just call the police' if small-scale local trouble arose.
- Community members reported the lowest percentage of awareness of community meetings.
- Second District residents were least likely to say they had reported a crime to the police in the last year, and second-least likely to say they had contacted MPDC police to give them any information.

Policing research conducted in Chicago by the Institute for Policy Research found that a population with a relatively high socio-economic level (a condition present in the Second District) is more likely to be willing to get involved and may be more trusting of and positive about police. But research findings also indicate that low violent crime rates – a condition also present in the Second District – may lessen the sense of urgency community members have about the need for personal involvement.

Institute for Policy Research Report: Resident Survey Findings

Table 4. Third District Rankings

	District 3 Problems	Problem Category	% Some and Big	% Big
1	Vandalized Cars	Social Disorder	68	27
2	Public Drinking	Social Disorder	63	25
4	Too Few Recreational Programs		62	31
5	Running Red Lights/Stop Signs	Social Disorder	62	31
3	Attacks and Robberies	Major Crime	62	15
6	Loitering Groups of People	Social Disorder	60	28
7	Beggars and Panhandlers really giving people a hard time	Social Disorder	60	22
9	Street Drug Dealing	Major Crime	56	26
8	Dirty Streets	Physical Disorder	56	19
10	Stolen Cars	Major Crime	52	15
11	Home Break-ins	Major Crime	52	14
12	Truancy	Social Disorder	49	23
13	Run Down Housing	Physical Disorder	48	14
14	Poor Street Lighting	Physical Disorder	48	13
15	Trash and Junk in Vacant Lots	Physical Disorder	45	15
16	Abandoned Buildings	Physical Disorder	42	13
17	Graffiti	Physical and Social Disorder	35	5
18	Disruption Around Schools	Social Disorder	34	10
19	Prostitution	Social Disorder	32	17
20	Gang Shootings and Violence	Major Crime	30	9
21	Abandoned Cars	Physical Disorder	26	6

Note: In each table, the most frequently reported neighborhood crime from each of the three problem categories – Social Disorder, Physical Disorder, and Major Crime – is highlighted.

- Third District residents reported the highest ‘% Some and Big’ problem percentages for almost all listed categories. These percentages were particularly high for the first three issues mentioned, and for the ‘Beggars and Panhandlers’ category.
- Reported ‘Big Problem’ percentages were not as comparatively high.

Other Key Community Issues and Information:

Public Perceptions of the Police

- Third District residents gave the lowest composite score for officer demeanor (how polite, concerned, helpful, and fair police officers were).
- Residents gave the second lowest composite score for police responsiveness to the public (deal with problems that concern residents, work together with residents).
- Residents gave police the lowest score on the job performance scale (help victims, prevent crime, keep order on the streets).
- Residents were second-most likely to report that police misconduct was an issue.

Public Satisfaction with Police Service

Residents who reported they had called police in the past year gave police many of the lowest district scores regarding their satisfaction with the way services were provided.

- Third District residents who initiated calls to police gave officers scores tied for lowest for paying careful attention to what they had to say, and for clearly explaining the action they would take in response to the call.
- They also reported that officers were least likely to tell them about some other place where they could get help, or refer the problem to some other city agency or organization for them to solve.
- Police were given the lowest overall ranking for being helpful, polite, or for how satisfied they were overall with the way the police handled the incident.

Residents who reported they were stopped by police consistently gave them the lowest district score regarding their satisfaction with the way the situation was handled.

- Residents were least likely to feel that police clearly explained why they wanted to talk with them, paid careful attention to what they had to say, were polite (tied for lowest with another district), clearly explained the action they would take, or were fair.
- The highest percentage of residents reported they were very dissatisfied overall with the way police responded.

Community Capacity

- Community members were least likely to report being aware of community meetings being held in their neighborhood.
- Third District residents were tied for last place in the reported percentage belonging to local neighborhood activities (neighborhood watch group or citizen patrol, PTA or ANC, local church or synagogue, local block club or community organization).
- Community members received one of the lowest composite scores regarding their willingness to intervene in a local altercation.
- Third District residents reported the lowest level of satisfaction with police response to citizen-initiated contacts.
- Third District residents were second most likely to feel that police misconduct was an issue.

Policing research conducted in Chicago by the Institute for Policy Research found that a highly diverse population (a condition present in the Third District) may be less likely to trust police or other community members, and may be less willing to get involved in community activities.

Institute for Policy Research Report: Resident Survey Findings

Table 5. Fourth District Rankings

	District 4 Problems	Problem Category	% Some and Big	% Big
1	Too Few Recreational Programs		62	39
2	Running Red Lights/Stop Signs	Social Disorder	60	33
3	Loitering Groups of People	Social Disorder	59	28
4	Street Drug Dealing	Major Crime	56	28
5	Public Drinking	Social Disorder	52	24
6	Vandalized Cars	Social Disorder	52	20
7	Stolen Cars	Major Crime	51	17
8	Home Break-ins	Major Crime	49	16
9	Truancy	Social Disorder	45	20
10	Attacks and Robberies	Major Crime	45	18
11	Poor Street Lighting	Physical Disorder	43	12
12	Dirty Streets	Physical Disorder	42	17
13	Run Down Housing	Physical Disorder	39	12
14	Trash and Junk in Vacant Lots	Physical Disorder	37	16
16	Disruption Around Schools	Social Disorder	36	14
15	Abandoned Buildings	Physical Disorder	36	10
17	Abandoned Cars	Physical Disorder	35	13
18	Beggars and Panhandlers really giving people a hard time	Social Disorder	33	14
19	Gang Shootings and Violence	Major Crime	33	13
20	Graffiti	Physical and Social Disorder	31	8
21	Prostitution	Social Disorder	25	11

Note: In each table, the most frequently reported neighborhood crime from each of the three problem categories – Social Disorder, Physical Disorder, and Major Crime – is highlighted.

- Fourth District residents reported slightly to somewhat higher than average percentages on almost all listed categories. ‘Street Drug Dealing’ was reported comparatively more frequently than average.

Other Key Community Issues and Information:

Public Perceptions of the Police

- Residents gave a slightly better than average rating for the officer demeanor scale (how polite, concerned, helpful, and fair police were).
- Residents gave the second highest composite score for police responsiveness to the public (deal with problems that concern residents, work together with residents).
- Residents gave police the second highest score on the job performance scale (help victims, prevent crime, keep order on the streets).

Public Satisfaction with Police Service

Residents who reported they had called police in the past year gave police fairly average scores regarding their satisfaction with the way services were provided.

- Residents gave police the second-highest score for coming quickly.
- While the overall percent of residents finding police 'somewhat to very helpful' was average, the percent of residents giving police the best score, 'very helpful', was significantly higher than any other district.
- While the overall percent of residents 'somewhat to very satisfied with the way police handled the incident' was average, the percent of residents giving police the highest score, 'very satisfied', was tied for highest.

Residents who reported they were stopped by police mostly gave fairly average scores regarding their satisfaction with the way the situation was handled.

- Fourth District police did receive the highest scores for politeness (by a fairly large margin).
- Fourth District police also tied for the largest percentage of residents feeling they had been 'very unfair'.

Community Capacity

- Community members received one of the two lowest scores regarding their willingness to intervene in a local altercation, and were one of the two most likely to report that they 'would just call police' in these circumstances.
- Fourth District residents were most likely to contact MPDC police to give them information.
- Residents reported a fairly average amount of awareness of community meetings and involvement with local organizations.

Institute for Policy Research Report: Resident Survey Findings

Table 6. Fifth District Rankings

	District 5 Problems	Problem Category	% Some and Big	% Big
1	Too Few Recreational Programs		63	40
2	Loitering Groups of People	Social Disorder	61	28
3	Street Drug Dealing	Major Crime	59	26
4	Running Red Lights/Stop Signs	Social Disorder	55	33
5	Public Drinking	Social Disorder	46	15
6	Stolen Cars	Major Crime	45	15
7	Trash and Junk in Vacant Lots	Physical Disorder	41	20
8	Vandalized Cars	Social Disorder	39	10
9	Dirty Streets	Physical Disorder	38	12
10	Truancy	Social Disorder	37	18
11	Run Down Housing	Physical Disorder	35	8
12	Home Break-ins	Major Crime	35	9
13	Abandoned Cars	Physical Disorder	34	14
14	Poor Street Lighting	Physical Disorder	34	11
15	Abandoned Buildings	Physical Disorder	31	14
16	Gang Shootings and Violence	Major Crime	30	10
17	Disruption Around Schools	Social Disorder	28	12
18	Attacks and Robberies	Major Crime	28	11
19	Beggars and Panhandlers really giving people a hard time	Social Disorder	23	8
20	Graffiti	Physical and Social Disorder	22	6
21	Prostitution	Social Disorder	21	10

Note: In each table, the most frequently reported neighborhood crime from each of the three problem categories – Social Disorder, Physical Disorder, and Major Crime – is highlighted.

Other Key Community Issues and Information:

Public Perceptions of the Police

- Fifth District residents gave the second highest score for officer demeanor (how polite, concerned, helpful, and fair police officers were).
- Fifth District residents gave fairly average composite scores to local police for police responsiveness to the public (deal with problems that concern residents, work together with residents), and job performance (help victims, prevent crime, keep order on the streets).

Public Satisfaction with Police Service

Residents who reported they had called police in the past year gave police above average scores regarding their satisfaction with the way services were provided.

- Police were given top ranks for being at least somewhat helpful and polite. Residents also gave Fifth District police one of the two highest scores for how satisfied they were with the way police handled the incident (50 percent of residents reported being 'very satisfied').
- The district received the most frequent reports of officers not arriving on the scene at all.

Residents who reported they were stopped by police gave them average scores regarding their satisfaction with the way the situation was handled.

Community Capacity

- Fifth District residents had the highest percentage reporting involvement in local neighborhood activities (neighborhood watch group or citizen patrol, PTA or ANC, local church or synagogue, local block club or community organization).
- Community members reported the second highest awareness level of community meetings.
- Residents were average in their reported willingness to intervene.

Table 7. Sixth District Rankings

	District 6 Problems	Problem Category	% Some and Big	% Big
1	Too Few Recreational Programs		64	38
2	Running Red Lights/Stop Signs	Social Disorder	60	36
3	Loitering Groups of People	Social Disorder	57	32
4	Street Drug Dealing	Major Crime	57	31
5	Stolen Cars	Major Crime	53	19
6	Truancy	Social Disorder	48	23
7	Vandalized Cars	Social Disorder	44	14
8	Home Break-ins	Major Crime	44	12
9	Public Drinking	Social Disorder	43	21
10	Gang Shootings and Violence	Major Crime	43	17
11	Trash and Junk in Vacant Lots	Physical Disorder	42	18
12	Dirty Streets	Physical Disorder	40	14
13	Attacks and Robberies	Major Crime	40	12
14	Run Down Housing	Physical Disorder	39	14
15	Abandoned Buildings	Physical Disorder	37	14
16	Abandoned Cars	Physical Disorder	36	16
17	Disruption Around Schools	Social Disorder	34	14
18	Poor Street Lighting	Physical Disorder	33	14
19	Beggars and Panhandlers really giving people a hard time	Social Disorder	27	11
20	Prostitution	Social Disorder	27	12
21	Graffiti	Physical and Social Disorder	22	6

Note: In each table, the most frequently reported neighborhood crime from each of the three problem categories – Social Disorder, Physical Disorder, and Major Crime – is highlighted.

- Sixth District residents' reports of problems ranged from more to less frequent than average. Both 'Street Drug Dealing' and 'Truancy' were considered more serious problems than in the majority of other districts.
- The percentage of residents reporting that problems were 'Big' was consistently higher than average for the District of Columbia.

Other Key Community Issues and Information:

Public Perceptions of the Police

- The Sixth District received somewhat below average scores (fifth place) on the following three scales: officer demeanor (how polite, concerned, helpful, and fair police officers were), police responsiveness to the public (deal with problems that concern residents, work together with residents), and police job performance (help victims, prevent crime, keep order on the streets).

Public Satisfaction with Police Service

Sixth District residents who reported contacting police in the last year generally gave police below-average to average scores for service.

- Residents gave police scores tied for lowest for paying careful attention to what they had to say, and for clearly explaining the action they would take in response to the call. Police were also given one of the two highest scores for being 'Not at all helpful'.
- Residents gave them better than average scores for telling them about some other place where they could get help, and average scores for their satisfaction with the way police handled the incident.

Residents who reported they were stopped by police generally gave police average to below-average scores regarding the way the situation was handled.

Community Capacity

- Sixth District residents received average to somewhat better than average scores on the community capacity scales (willingness to intervene, awareness of community meetings, organization involvement).
- Sixth District residents were most likely to volunteer that their neighbors would just call police if there were some small-scale trouble taking place.

Table 8. Seventh District Rankings

	District 7 Problems	Problem Category	% Some and Big	% Big
1	Too Few Recreational Programs		68	44
2	Loitering Groups of People	Social Disorder	59	36
3	Street Drug Dealing	Major Crime	59	35
4	Truancy	Social Disorder	54	33
5	Gang Shootings and Violence	Major Crime	51	25
6	Running Red Lights/Stop Signs	Social Disorder	50	29
7	Public Drinking	Social Disorder	48	21
8	Stolen Cars	Major Crime	45	18
9	Run Down Housing	Physical Disorder	44	18
10	Poor Street Lighting	Physical Disorder	44	17
11	Trash and Junk in Vacant Lots	Physical Disorder	43	18
12	Dirty Streets	Physical Disorder	42	20
13	Abandoned Buildings	Physical Disorder	41	18
14	Vandalized Cars	Social Disorder	41	13
15	Disruption Around Schools	Social Disorder	40	19
16	Attacks and Robberies	Major Crime	38	18
17	Home Break-ins	Major Crime	35	12
18	Prostitution	Social Disorder	33	19
19	Abandoned Cars	Physical	30	14
20	Beggars and Panhandlers really giving people a hard time	Social Disorder	28	13
21	Graffiti	Physical and Social Disorder	23	8

Note: In each table, the most frequently reported neighborhood crime from each of the three problem categories – Social Disorder, Physical Disorder, and Major Crime – is highlighted.

- Seventh District residents reported the first or second highest ‘% Some and Big’ problem percentages for almost half of the listed categories.
- The percentage of residents reporting that issues were a ‘Big Problem’ were generally the highest reported in D.C.
- Residents were particularly concerned about a lack of recreational programs, street drug dealing, and were more likely to consider ‘Truancy’ and ‘Gang Shootings and Violence’ a ‘Big’ or ‘Some’ problem than any other district.

Other Key Community Issues and Information:

Public Perceptions of the Police

- Seventh District residents gave the second lowest score for officer demeanor (how polite, concerned, helpful, and fair police officers were).
- Residents gave the lowest score for police responsiveness to the public (deal with problems that concern residents, work together with residents).
- Residents gave police the second lowest score on the job performance scale (help victims, prevent crime, keep order on the streets).
- Residents were most likely to report police misconduct was an issue.

Public Satisfaction with Police Service

Residents who reported they had called police in the past year gave police scores ranging from below average to above average regarding their satisfaction with the way services were provided.

- Seventh District residents were most likely to feel that police made them wait too long before coming to the scene of a crime after they were called.
- When they talked to police though, they were most likely to feel that officers paid careful attention to what they had to say, and that officers clearly explained the action they would take in response to the call.
- They also reported that officers were most likely to tell them about some other place where they could get help, or refer the problem to some other city agency or organization for them to solve.
- Overall residents were second-most likely to feel that police were somewhat or very helpful.

Residents who reported they were stopped by police gave police scores ranging from above average to below average regarding their satisfaction with the way the situation was handled.

- A relatively high percentage of residents felt police did a good job of explaining why they wanted to talk to them, and the action they would take.
- Seventh District residents were less satisfied as a whole “with the way police responded.”

Community Capacity

- Community members received one of the two lowest scores regarding their willingness to intervene in a local altercation.
- Residents reported an average level of awareness of community meetings and organizational involvement.
- Seventh District residents were least likely to say that they had contacted MPDC police to give them any information.